SUMMARY

OF THE

1998 CHEMICAL STOCKPILE EMERGENCY PREPAREDNESS PROGRAM

NATIONAL CONFERENCE

June 29 - July 1, 1998

Renaissance Harborplace Hotel
Baltimore, MD

TABLE OF CONTENTS

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The 1998 Chemical Stockpile Emergency Preparedness Program (CSEPP) National Conference was held at the Renaissance Harborplace Hotel in Baltimore, Maryland , June 29 through July 1, 1998.

A single plenary session was held the morning of June 30, 1998. During that session, comments were provided by eight senior CSEPP officials. The morning session culminated with a presentation that emphasized the similarities of the management style used during the Lewis and Clark Expedition, from 1804 through 1806, to those that are evolving to guide future implementation of CSEPP. Breakout sessions, covering a range of subject areas, were held the first afternoon and for the remaining portion of the conference. These sessions featured either panel discussions or topical presentations, and all included time for questions and answers. Each breakout session was presented twice to give participants flexibility in their choice of topics. The following summary of the proceedings covers both the plenary and all breakout sessions. Initial and repeated breakout sessions are summarized under a single functional or topical heading.

ACRONYMS

ACWA	Assembled Chemical Weapons Assessment
AYE	Alternate Year Exercises
BDO	battle dress overgarment
BG	Brigadier General
CA	cooperative agreement
CAR	Capability Assessment for Readiness
CAIRA	Chemical Accident/Incident Response and Assistance
CAMDS	Chemical Agent Munitions Disposal System
CBDCOM	U.S. Army Chemical and Biological Defense Command
CCA	Comprehensive Cooperative Agreements
CERCLA	Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act
CHPPM	Center for Health Promotion and Preventive Medicine
COTS	commercial-off-the-shelf
CSDP	Chemical Stockpile Demilitarization Program
CSEP	Chemical Stockpile Emergency Preparedness
CSEPP	Chemical Stockpile Emergency Preparedness Program
DACs	Disaster Assistance Centers
DAS	Deputy Assistant Secretary
decon	decontamination
DoD	U.S. Department of Defense
DODAAC	Department of Defense Acquisition Accounting Code
DOE	U.S. Department of Energy
DCO	Disaster Coordinating Officer
EAS	Emergency Alert System (formerly known as Emergency Broadcast System [EBS])
EBS	Emergency Broadcasting System
EMA	Emergency Management Agency
EMF	Emergency Management Function
EMI	Emergency Management Institute
EMIS	Emergency Management Information System
EMS	Emergency Medical Services
EOC	Emergency Operations Center
ESOH	Environment, Safety, and Occupational Health
FCC	Federal Communications Commission
FEMA	Federal Emergency Management Agency
FEMIS	Federal Emergency Management Information System
FME	Federally Managed Exercises
FRP	Federal Response Plan
FTCA	Federal Tort Claims Act
FY	fiscal year

ACRONYMS (Cont'd.)

GB	Nerve agent
GIS	geographical information system
GPS	Global Positioning System
HAZMAT	hazardous materials
HQ	Headquarters
IEM	Innovative Emergency Management, Inc.
IPT	integrated process (product) team
IRZ	Immediate Response Zone
IVV	Independent Verification and Validation
JACADS	Johnston Atoll Chemical Agent Disposal System
JIC	Joint Information Center
LCCE	Life Cycle Cost Estimate
MEMA	Maryland Emergency Management Agency
MCA	Military Claims Act
MG	Major General
MOA	memorandum of agreement
MOU	memorandum of understanding
MCE	maximum credible event
NCP	National Contingency Plan
NEMA	National Emergency Management Association
NOAA	National Oceanographic and Atmospheric Administration
NTIS	National Technical Information Service
OGC	Office of General Counsel
O&M	operations and maintenance
OMB	Office of Management and Budget
OSC	On-Scene Coordinator
PAPR	powered air-purifying respirator
PAO	public affairs officer
PF	protection factor
PIO	public information officer
PMCD	Program Manager for Chemical Demilitarization
POC	point of contact
PPA	Performance Partnership Agreement
PPE	personal protective equipment
PPM	Program Performance Monitoring
PTE	Preparedness, Training, and Exercises
RCRA	Resource Conservation and Recovery Act
RISC	Regional Interagency Steering Committee
RRT	Regional Response Team

ACRONYMS (Cont'd.)

SAIC	Science Applications International Corporation
SBA	Small Business Administration
SCBA	self-contained breathing apparatus
SEMIS	State Emergency Management Information System
SRF	Service Response Force
TARS	Tone Alert Radio System
TOCDF	Tooele Chemical Disposal Facility
TracSys	Emergency Task and Response Tracking System
UMCD	Umatilla Chemical Depot
USADAC	U.S. Army Defense Ammunition Center
USARCS	U.S. Army Claims Service
VX	Nerve Agent
Y2K	year 2000

PLENARY SESSION
Tuesday, June 30, 1998
8:00 - 11:30 AM

Welcome by Mr. David McMillion, Director, Maryland Emergency Management Agency

Mr. David McMillion, Director, Maryland Emergency Management Agency (MEMA), welcomed the conference participants and introduced the plenary session panelists. Maryland Adjutant General James F. Fretterd then welcomed the conference participants on behalf of the State of Maryland.

Summary of Presentation by Rita Calvan, FEMA

Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) Region III Director Rita Calvan provided an overview of the Region III CSEP Program. The key to its success is cooperation between MEMA, the three Maryland CSEPP counties, and the Army. The most recent exercise in Maryland identified no deficiencies, in part because of the excellent training program that is in place. Other key program elements are the advanced public warning system and the neutralization program, which promises to eliminate the Aberdeen Proving Ground stockpile within six years. Ms. Calvan introduced Mr. Russell Salter of FEMA Headquarters.

Summary of Presentation by Russell Salter, FEMA

Mr. Salter thanked the conference participants for attending and the State of Maryland for its excellent planning effort, notably Mr. McMillion, Major General Fretterd, and Mr. George Krock. Last year, FEMA and the Army announced agreement in principal on a new relationship. This new relationship has borne fruit in a new cooperative attitude on the part of all. In particular, Mr. Denzel Fisher, Mr. Ray Fatz, Major General (MG) George Friel, Dr. Theodore Prociv, and all of the Army deserve thanks. Significant progress has been made in decentralizing administration of the program; FEMA is weeks away from completing this effort. The FEMA staff has done an excellent job in supporting him and in implementing this initiative. The integrated product teams (IPTs) are working well, and exercises are proving that we are prepared. A new management system now exists to assess preparedness, which will provide future dividends. Mr. Salter expressed his pride in becoming a part of the program. Tough issues remain, but now the right environment exists to tackle these issues. The ultimate challenge is to provide for the health and safety of our public, and we will reach our goal if we keep focused on it and on our partnership. He reviewed the conference agenda and thanked the planning team for its excellent work. Mr. Salter then introduced Ms. Kay Goss.

Summary of Presentation by Kay Goss, FEMA

Ms. Kay Goss, FEMA Associate Director for Preparedness, Training, and Exercises (PTE), gave the conference participants greetings from Director James L. Witt and from President Clinton. Both are aware of the CSEP Program's new attitude and partnership. Preparedness is the foundation of emergency management. The job of the directorate is to offer technical expertise, guidance,

coordination, and other support to achieve this goal. The preparedness mission is critical, especially in view of the estimated $1 billion per week that disasters are presently costing the United States. Ms. Goss summarized several of FEMA's most recent major initiatives, noting that the CSEP states averaged 5.3% higher than average on 13 keys to readiness and 7.08% higher than non-CSEPP states in overall preparedness, as measured by the FEMA readiness assessment. While FEMA recognizes that all capabilities are not yet completed, most benchmark items have been achieved. In the upcoming FEMA reorganization, Mr. Salter will become Director of the Chemical and Radiological Preparedness Division, which will include CSEPP, the Radiological Emergency Preparedness, and hazardous materials (HAZMAT) programs. Also, Ms. Goss is creating the Readiness Division to address issues identified at exercises and in response to after-action reports. In August, she will begin rotating FEMA regional people through headquarters. In closing, she noted her great pride in the efforts being made by program participants. Additional future accomplishments undoubtedly will follow.

Summary of Presentation by Mr. Raymond Fatz, Army

Mr. Raymond Fatz, Deputy Assistant Secretary of the Army (DAS) for Environment, Safety, and Occupational Health (ESOH) provided an overview of the Army's administration of the CSEP Program, notably the roles played by himself, Mr. James Bacon, and the U.S. Chemical and Biological Defense Command (CBDCOM). He has a small office staff, notably including Mr. Patrick Wakefield and Mr. Denzel Fisher. His office primarily serves as an advocate for CSEPP and other programs to offices above his level, including Congress. One success of the CSEPP partnership has been to show Congress that the program is working, which nets more funding. The Chemical Stockpile Demilitarization Program (CSDP) must be part of our partnership. The CSEP Program began as one of the mitigation steps included in the CSDP, in the unlikely event of an accident. In 1997, Congress instructed the Army and FEMA either to begin partnering or to separate in administering the CSEP Program. Both agencies reviewed their core competencies and their accountabilities, with considerable state and local input. The new organization was a natural result, with more authority and responsibility pushed downward to the local level. Thus, the CSEP team includes cooperative decision making at all levels. The key challenges, some of which will be addressed in breakout sessions, include maintaining the integrity of the team, implementing quarterly progress reviews, several technical challenges requiring CBDCOM support, meeting environmental permit requirements for the CSDP, maintaining and enhancing Congressional support, and updating and defining requirements. The CSEPP team must have a shared vision in order to achieve preparedness and this conference is a significant step in that direction. In closing, Mr. Fatz wished all participants an excellent conference.

Summary of Presentation by Dr. Theodore Prociv, Army

Dr. Theodore Prociv, DAS for Chemical Demilitarization, reviewed the cost growth in the CSDP and its many technical changes. Estimated life cycle costs, for example, have grown from $1.7 billion to $15.7 billion, and the destruction deadline has been extended from 1994 to 2007. Ten percent of the stockpile is now destroyed. All GB agent stored at Johnston Atoll has been destroyed. By the end of this year, destruction of 92% of the stockpile will be under contract. Among the factors

driving these changes have been a more formal safety inspection program, more rigorous environmental permitting requirements (about which the Army is now much more proactive), more active public outreach, diversified destruction technology development (alternative technologies), lawsuits at each site, impact mitigation costs (for which no legal mechanism currently exists to implement), and demands for more precise cost and schedule control. Our job here is much more than program management. It also includes bringing the communities into the program and gaining their support. We need to get the most out of our dollars in order to achieve these goals and to meet the deadlines contained in the Chemical Weapons Convention.

Summary of Presentation by Brigadier General Doesburg, CBDCOM

Brigadier General (BG) John Doesburg, incoming Commander of CBDCOM explained that the two elements of his presentation are "emergency preparedness" and "teamwork." Emergency preparedness is extremely important in order to prepare for a possible emergency. Teamwork is essential to make this goal a success. On Johnston Atoll, huge improvements in preparedness and teamwork have occurred since the time incinerator construction was initiated. Early in CSEPP, we did not fully appreciate the significance of preparedness and teamwork. We now have learned that lesson and are moving ahead.

Summary of Presentation by Mr. Denzel Fisher, Army

Mr. Denzel Fisher, Assistant for Special Programs, Office of the DAS for ESOH. Mr. Fisher thanked the State of Maryland, FEMA, and the Army leadership, especially Mr. Mike Walker, Dr. Prociv, MG Friel, BG Doesburg, Mr. Bacon, Mr. Fatz, and Mr. Salter. One of the Army's CSEP objectives is to push decisions down to the installation level. Federal legislation to codify the existing agreement between FEMA and the Army has been proposed. Last week, the Senate passed part of this proposal. Next year, the Army and FEMA will try to get the remainder of this program approved. Meanwhile, Mr. Salter and he will continue to build bridges to Congressional staff. He looks forward to working with everybody to make the program a success.

Summary of Presentation by Brigadier General Harold Sterns, Montana National Guard

Brigadier General Harold Sterns, Assistant Adjutant General of the Montana National Guard reviewed a number of the terms that the morning's speakers had discussed. The key concept for him is Team CSEPP. The conference title is "The CSEPP Expedition." It bears analogy to the Lewis and Clark expedition that started in 1804. President Jefferson sent Lewis and Clark out to satisfy the national curiosity about the unknown West, especially to find out whether a Northwest Passage existed. Lewis and Clark were given a shared command to explore the West and had to become a team in order to succeed. The expedition covered over 6,000 miles and visited 53 Native American tribes. They faithfully kept journals detailing their experiences. The expedition was operated as a democracy, with each member given an equal vote, even the slave. Many of the adverse situations they faced were noted in that night's journal with the concluding entry "we proceed on." When they returned, their map of America became the standard for the next 50 years. This expedition was truly a team effort and is an inspiration to all of us. We all have to "proceed on" to meet our own

challenges -- to have the readiness, perseverance, and commitment to achieve our goals.

BREAKOUT SESSIONS

Tuesday, June 30, 1998
Wednesday, July 1, 1998

Automation

Tuesday, June 30 and Wednesday, July 1, 1998
1:30 PM and 10:00 AM

Summary of Presentations by Darius Kwiedorowick, CBDCOM and Representatives of Innovative Emergency Management, Inc.

The presentations described simulation of a national concept of operations by on-post and off-post players to demonstrate how automation might fit into site specific operations. The presentations were based on an example at the Umatilla Chemical Depot (UMCD). The demonstrations illustrated how the Emergency Management Information System (EMIS) and the Federal Emergency Management Information System (FEMIS) communicate on a daily basis, support ongoing emergency operations center (EOC) response, and the use of automation during an emergency. The first part of the presentation addressed daily work planning and alert and notification following an accident. The second part of the presentation portrayed the response activities of EOC staff. The third part of the presentation illustrated the activities of an off-post Public Information Officer (PIO) and an on-post Public Affairs Officer (PAO), and showed how using automation can aid in accomplishing their respective responsibilities. Updates on EMIS/FEMIS latest releases and year 2000 (Y2K) compliance were also provided. EMIS 3.1 builds 16 and 17 were tested by Innovative Emergency Management, Incorporated (IEM). Build 17 is to make the system Y2K compliant. Inasmuch the hardware platforms and the commercial-off-the-shelf (COTS) software platforms are Y2K compliant, the Army will certify that EMIS and FEMIS are Y2K compliant.

Capability Assessment for Readiness (CAR)

Tuesday, June 30, and Wednesday, July 1, 1998
3:30 and 1:30 PM

Summary of Presentation by Mike Pawlowski, FEMA

Mike Pawlowski, State and Local Programs Support, FEMA HQ, presented and distributed a report done by the National Emergency Management Association and FEMA. The report is the end result of a request by the Senate Appropriations Committee for FEMA to provide an assessment of results under the Government Performance and Results Act. The report outlines the current status of emergency management capabilities in all 50 states and six territories. The states conducted self-assessments based on major emergency management functions (EMFs) each of which subdivide into

a total of over 1600 attributes. The EMFs are: Laws and Authorities; Hazard Identification and Risk Assessment; Hazard Management; Resource Management; Planning; Direction, Control, and Coordination; Communications and Warnings; Operations and Procedures; Logistics and Facilities; Training; Exercises; Public Education and Information; and Finance and Administration.

The results indicated states participating in the CSEPP reported higher levels of preparedness, as measured against the EMFs, than non-CSEPP states. Enhanced preparedness levels were cited as National Emergency Management Strengths. Some session attendees felt the report did not show a true, accurate picture of the actual readiness of the CSEPP counties. Collectively, they felt CSEPP counties were much better prepared for emergency situations than non-CSEPP jurisdictions. They felt the assessment should have been extended to the county level for local input versus being accomplished at the state level. The next CAR is to be conducted in the 1st quarter fiscal year (FY) 2000 to support the next 5 year Performance Partnership Agreement (PPA) to be negotiated between FEMA and the states for in-place operation at the start of FY 2001.

FEMA has developed a software program for individual jurisdiction use to accomplish a self-assessment of emergency preparedness capabilities. Attendees were provided copies of this program on diskettes. Copies can be obtained by calling the FEMA POC, Mike Pawlowski, at 202-646-3080.

Chemical Demilitarization Update

Tuesday, June 30, and Wednesday, July 1, 1998
1:30 PM

Summary of Presentation by Paul Bergeron, Army

Mr. Paul G. Bergeron, Associate Project Manager, UMCD, presented an overview of the chemical demilitarization program. He reviewed the national stockpile and the baseline incineration process, including its evolution. Chemical Agent Munitions Disposal System (CAMDS) has been the test bed for the baseline process. The Johnston Atoll Chemical Agent Disposal System (JACADS) is the prototype for the baseline incineration process and has been operational since 1990. Operational verification was completed in 1993. Over 1500 tons of agent have now been destroyed at JACADS. Operations should be entirely completed by the fourth quarter of FY 2000. The Tooele Chemical Agent Disposal Facility (TOCDF), the first full-scale facility, was completed in 1996. Mr. Bergeron then went into a review of each site starting with Johnston Atoll, then Tooele, Anniston, Umatilla, Pine Bluff, Pueblo, and Blue Grass. About 13% of the Tooele stockpile has now been destroyed. Anniston is now under construction and is about 22% complete. The anticipated completion date is during the second quarter of FY 2000. Full-scale operations are scheduled for the second quarter of FY 2002, with systemization occurring between FY 2000 and FY 2002. Construction at Umatilla is about 21% complete. Systemization is scheduled for the third quarter of FY 2000, with full-scale operations set for the second quarter of FY 2002. The Pine Bluff construction project is now proceeding. Award of the Resource Conservation and Recovery Act (RCRA) permit is expected during the fourth quarter of FY 1998. Systemization is set for the second quarter of FY 2001, with full-scale operations anticipated two years later. It was explained that under

federal law, construction cannot proceed at Pueblo or Blue Grass. Further, both Aberdeen and Newport have been chosen to be alternate technologies sites. The Maryland RCRA permits are expected in late August or September 1998. The construction contract award date is dependent on appropriations. At Newport, the systems contract is expected by March 1999, perhaps as early as January. Operations at both facilities are expected to be completed by the end of January 2004.

Q: Have there been any significant design changes between the facilities at Tooele and other sites?
A: Yes. The facilities are evolving as we find things that will make the design more efficient. To date, the design team has looked at 1700 possible design changes. Most of these are not significant, in fact, some are as simple as redesigning the entrance and egress plan/procedure to allow for a more efficient flow of personnel in and out of the facility.

Q: When will Anniston destruction be complete?
A: First quarter of FY 2006.

Q: How big of a question is reversibility?
A: This is no longer an issue due to technical advances.

Q: Does cost estimate include closure costs?
A: No.

Q: How well tested are techniques?
A: Very well tested. Have been bench tested and pilot tested.

Summary of Presentation by Scott Susman, Army

Scott Susman discussed the Assembled Chemical Weapons Assessment (ACWA) Program. Mike Parker is the Program Manager. P.L. 104-208 requires an assessment of assembled chemical weapons. A report is due back to Congress in September 1998, with a supplemental report on technology demonstrations to follow. The Keystone Center, a non-profit public policy and educational organization, is convening a dialogue group and exchange on ACWA for each CSEPP site, including state, local, and tribal regulators and national interest organizations (e.g., the Sierra Club). Criteria for evaluating various destruction technologies have been developed. Among these is the requirement that the technology be a total solution, not a partial solution. Selected technologies will be demonstrated and the results provided to Congress. A Citizens Advisory Technical Team established in order to handle proprietary aspects of the problem is a subset of the dialogue group. Decisions to date have been by consensus. A final ranking has been completed, with a final decision on the best value technology to be announced in early July. Mr. Bergeron reported on the technologies under review and provided a list of information sources, including the ACWA Program website address.

C: One company has already issued a press release indicating its technology had been selected for demonstration.
A: This was an incorrect interpretation; selection will not be announced until July 6.

Q: Is it possible for all six technologies to be demonstrated?
A: Yes.

Q: When will Congress make a decision?
A: April 1999 at the earliest.

Q: When must decisions be made in order to meet Chemical Weapons Convention deadlines?
A: I do not know.

A video on the alternate technology program was presented. Copies of the video were made available to attendees.

Communications
Tuesday, June 30, and Wednesday, July 1,1998
3:30 PM and 1:30 PM

Summary of Round Table Discussions

Both sessions were roundtable discussions of communications topics. Initial discussions related to tone-alert radios (TARs). The performance of TAR vendors, loss ratios, cost of radios, and various vendors involved in manufacturing/marketing the radios were discussed. Also discussed were various technical problems associated with TAR activation. Carl Ballinger, Pueblo County CSEPP Manager, outlined the problems they have encountered getting delivery of their TARs. Pueblo County selected a TAR vendor and, as yet, have no radios. The contract is now being discussed/disputed between the County Attorney and an attorney for the vendor.

Don Broughton, Madison County CSEPP Director, described some of their experience with the same vendor selected by Pueblo County and other issues. Latest on the problem vendor's radio is that there are over 40 items to be addressed as a result of a meeting with the Federal Communications Commission (FCC). A team of ten engineers, with oversight by three other engineers, is working on these issues. Madison County is going to the Local Emergency Information System as a means of alerting the public. Lessons learned by Madison County include using multiple siren tones and sequences to mitigate innumerable problems created by using the TARs as an indoor siren. Because some radios were being moved from their original zone to other zones, Madison County has gone from a zoned siren and tone-alert scheme to a more general scheme. By using TARs a significant benefit was realized in public education. Trained teams provided information to residents as they installed the radios. Pueblo County stands ready to take advantage of the same strategy.

Terry Madden, Region IV, suggested that FEMA look into what, if anything, it can do to resolve this situation. He will contact Russ Salter to discuss this issue and see if he (Salter) can and will get involved. When the same issue was raised during the second session, Terry Madden and Dan Feighert indicated they would look into the problem and provide a response.

Pueblo County is replacing the old NOAA transmitters. Utah is using regular NOAA weather radios. The status of negotiating memoranda of understanding (MOU) or agreement (MOA) with the National Weather Service was discussed. Pueblo County completed its MOA after almost a year of negotiation.

At least two counties, Jefferson County, Arkansas and Talladega County, Alabama, are sending signals to activate TARs through their local Emergency Alerting System (EAS) radio stations. Eventually the system will be activated by a single button. Discussion followed about CSEPP-dedicated communications systems.

As a result of installing very sophisticated communications systems, maintenance is very costly. Planning should begin now for transition to a more affordable maintenance approach once CSEPP goes away. Jefferson County Arkansas has been able to reduce maintenance costs by maintaining fixed systems only. They do not have maintenance agreements on mobile or portable radios. As those non-fixed assets go out, they swap them out with their reserve equipment and then have the items repaired. Various county agencies (fire, Sheriff's office, ambulance service, public works, etc.) assume responsibility for maintenance of their portable and mobile radios, as well as items such as batteries, battery chargers, and uninterruptible power systems. A major element of maintenance agreements is the length of response times (it is going to be much more costly for response times under an hour versus response times of four hours). Another problem related to communications is surge protection. Some counties reported various outage problems from lightning and shorting of power lines from a mylar balloon falling across transmission lines.

Terry Madden suggested that FEMA review the guidance to allow greater flexibility in establishing maintenance agreements as a means of saving maintenance funds. Federal regulations do not allow for contingency funds. There are appropriate ways to budget for planned maintenance.

A general discussion followed about the need to improve communication between the state, local and national levels on lessons learned, and how communication problems are being resolved. It was proposed that a workshop be developed. Dan Feighert suggested a conference call between interested parties to determine if there are sufficient issues to support holding a workshop. FEMA communications staff would explore the subject and provide a response.

Exercise
Wednesday, July 1,1998
8:00 AM and 3:30 PM

Summary of Presentation by Steve Douglas, Pueblo County Colorado

Steve Douglas, Pueblo County, CO discussed CSEPP Policy Paper #16. He then described the differences between the previous and revised methods of conducting CSEPP exercises (Federally Managed [FME] and Alternate Year [AYE]). Some of the characteristics include developing a long range versus an independent schedule; participation would be on a two versus four year cycle, with communities required to demonstrate all pertinent objectives every exercise every two years and "core objectives" every four years. Scheduling of the AYE requires three possible dates so they can be coordinated with the FME schedule. Installations would do a "full-up" exercise for every exercise. The constraints on scheduling the FME and AYE were presented using flexibility in conducting the Colorado/Pueblo exercise as an example.

Q: Who signs off on the AYE?
A: The State Co-Director if an FME is not requested.

Q: What happens if a significant finding resulted from an AYE?
A: Corrective actions can occur during a quarterly CAIRA , the AYE or other exercises.

Summary of Presentation by Lorin Larsen, Utah

Lorin Larsen, Utah CEM, discussed the possibility of a "Stop and Go" exercise concept to include multiple variations/options. The rationale and benefits were discussed. These include: the capability for immediate corrective action, a chance for participants to practice, greater adaptability, and the chance for troubleshooting the system.

Q: Is there going to be a trained cadre of observers/controllers for AYE? There appears to be interest in developing a training program that will focus on observation techniques versus theory.
A: The IPT recommends State and local evaluators be trained. It was noted that more evaluators are needed in the system. It is planned to conduct training two times a year, once on the East coast and once on the West coast. Additionally, the Emergency Management Institute (EMI) has evaluator training courses that can be delivered in the field. It was mentioned that the opportunity of an AYE can result in more work or cost to the communities.

Q: Are there any disadvantages to the "Stop and Go" exercise?
A: More planning is required, better or different evaluation requirements need to be developed, and community coordination must be expanded.

Q: Are there no more core objectives?

A: There are no more core objectives. The community will demonstrate all applicable objectives during a FME.

Q: Is there an extent of play during the FME?
A: Yes

C: Utah will be conducting an FME during their AYE year. This will allow more flexibility. They have run exercises within exercises in the past.

Q: Could the program require every jurisdiction to demonstrate the core objectives every FME?
A: The IPT will discuss the issue.

.

Q: What is the status of the "lessons learned" and the CSEPP Exercise Database?
A: The data base has been completed and will be distributed within a few weeks. The "lessons learned" have been distributed in the past.

Summary of Presentation by Joe Bell, Indiana

Joe Bell, Indiana Emergency Management Agency, discussed how Indiana and Illinois will conduct next year's AYE and use it as a training tool. It would be necessary to determine the AYE 99 "mission statement" and list of exercise goals so that the level of support can be determined. He outlined the following proposed goals: (1) conduct field play with first responders wearing PPE, (2) activate TAR in 15 homes, (3) demonstrate different types of decon equipment, (4) test changes to the JIC plan, and (5) allow the exercise clock to be advanced or stopped. After the mission statement and exercise goals are established, a decision on the level of federal support will be made. Following that decision, the question of whether a FEMA Co-Director is needed will be addressed. Steve Douglas, Pueblo County, stated that he supported the AYE because it represented an opportunity for the community rather than an imposition. Its benefits include: community choice, better capability after CSEPP due to learning how to conduct rather than "play" an exercise, incorporation of the recovery aspects, and an opportunity for the community staff to observe other activities outside their regular day-to-day duties. Deroy Holt, FEMA Region VIII, indicated the IPT was in the process of putting together a task list or check list to help plan exercises. Further, they were developing an extent-of-play guidance package. They emphasized that FEMA Regional representation should be a part of the planning team, and the community should look ahead to ensure money is available to support the exercise.

Butch Reeves, Pine Bluff Chemical Activity, stated the installation would play "full up" every year, that planning responsibility would be delegated to the installation level, that limited simulation will be desired to ensure realism, and that they would continue to bring in the people who incorporate other aspects of CSEPP into the exercise program. Frank Rainey, Anniston Chemical Activity, pointed out the installations have a need for "community cohesiveness" with the off-post team effort.

Q: Is the Service Response Force (SRF) going to be a part of the exercise?
A: There is going to be more emphasis on SRF response in exercises. However, the SRF is formed only if an actual accident exists, and SRF members are people who have primary day-to-day jobs within the Army.

Q: Could an installation representative "play" SRF during an exercise?
A: The SRF function needs to be exercised because it is an integral part of response and recovery.

Q: Can the Army Co-Director coordinate the SRF "play" for an exercise?
A: Yes, however they need to start coordination early to permit SRF participation.

Legal

Tuesday, June 30, and Wednesday, July 1, 1998
3:30 PM and 10:00 AM

Both sessions were open sessions with no formal presentations by any of the eight panelists. The FEMA and Army representatives briefly outlined how their organizations would respond to a chemical warfare agent accident/incident, then devoted the remainder of the time to answering specific questions raised by the audience. Some of the questions and responses are:

Q: What will the Claims Service do if there is a release?
A: Masterson: U.S. Army Claims Service (USARCS) has to investigate before a claim payment is made. The Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act (CERCLA) may also come into play.

Q: Who else could be responsible?
A: Holm: There has to be an accident investigation as it may be, for example, an Air Force plane which crashed into an igloo rather than an Army-caused accident. Also, the Army's lawyers cannot admit responsibility before an accident.
Masterson: The amount of damages may be the real question and whether it was directly related to chemical storage.
Flanders: Whether there was a superseding intervening act also matters.

Q: What if a contractor is involved?
A: Masterson: The Federal Tort Claims Act (FTCA) is the major means of payment. Acts have to be negligent or wrongful and have to be by a government employee, not a contractor.

Q: Who is responsible if EG&G (Deseret's contractor) causes an accident?
A: Masterson: We would need to know if there are any indemnification clauses in the contract.

Holm: Plaintiff's attorney will sue everyone and let the court settle things. Politically no one will make it a public display of fighting. There will be a one stop claims shop with all jurisdictions represented.

Q: Will the Stafford Act or something else be used?

A: Holm: The Stafford Act would be used because it is quick and it has a rapid claims/loss tele-registration process. CSEPP states should look at immediately requesting a declaration.

Waller: Clarification is needed as to a required state match of funds if there is a declaration. Caution: The same determination will have to be made as with any disaster. Also, small business loans come from the Small Business Administration (SBA), not through FEMA. The Stafford Act does not cover agricultural losses.

Q: What about an emergency declaration as opposed to a major disaster declaration -- what is the difference?

A: Waller: An emergency declaration is different; it is easier to trigger because less money is involved. A disaster declaration should be considered a supplemental resource to support state and local resources. FEMA will look at the dollar amount of damage, what happened, and the ability to recover. The President can declare an emergency on his own. There are very specific triggers for a disaster declaration.

Q: Does there have to be fire, flood, or explosion?

A: Waller: It has to be a "catastrophe."

Q: Does it matter if there is a responsible party?

A: Waller: No, the Stafford Act provides for FEMA to look for reimbursement if there is a responsible party. For example, FEMA is looking for reimbursement from the Chicago flood since there was a duplication of funding due to insurance. FEMA looks at the impact before recommending a disaster declaration.

Q: Will the Army pay if it is clearly an Army accident?

A: Flanders: The Army will look at all legal authorities. CERCLA can cover cleanup and temporary evacuation costs.

Masterson: USARCS determines liability and cover claims for property and personal injury. There must be legal authority. A disaster declaration would not affect claims payments from the Army.

Flanders: Before the FTCA was passed there was no means of reimbursing plaintiffs for their losses. The government has sovereign immunity, that is, the government cannot be sued without waiving its sovereign immunity. The FTCA and CERCLA do allow for such a waiver.

Holm: Payment under the Military Claims Act (MCA) still pertains if there are appropriate grounds.

C: During several exercises an issue arose when the relatives of dead/injured employees requested that the names not be released to the media. (Privacy Act implications).

A: Egan: The precedent is that the Army respects the wishes of the relatives. Once a medical official issues a certificate of death, then it is a matter of public record.

Q: Can the Army provide a white paper discussing who is liable, thereby providing for a level of accountability?

A: Flanders: Each jurisdiction should talk to their municipal lawyer for appropriate information.
Masterson: The Army does want to give local governments as much information as possible, it is best given by a local depot lawyer. A piece of paper admitting liability is a hard thing to create. USARCS can give information on the claims service and how to file.
Duncan: AMC lawyers are best qualified to answer such questions regarding indemnification by a contractor. You have to look at the particular contract and what it says. The key is that indemnification is not a "pass go" card. Someone will be liable, but the Army cannot determine who is liable without the facts.

Q: Who calls the Claims Service?

A: Vasco: The Depot Commander or Service Response Force Commander can call the local Claims Service Office.
Masterson: There are over 100 claims offices worldwide.
Waller: FEMA may not be at the one stop claims shop; FEMA prefers tele-registration to DACs (Disaster Assistance Centers) because they are faster.
Holm: People may not want to file a claim over a phone, however.

Q: Who will legally protect the citizens?

A: Holm: Individuals may have to have a personal lawyer to represent their interests on a contingency basis.

Q: Is there a plan for another legal seminar to address legal issues?

A: Flanders: There was a conference three years ago to discuss various issues. Two years ago there was a collateral accident investigation workshop. There was a Memorandum of Agreement (MOA) workshop planned for August, however, an IPT will be formed to look at the issues first.

Q: Should local Army installation lawyers be developing exercise play for handling claims?

A: Yes. We would be glad to help facilitate this.

Q: Do claims statutes authorize claims to the general public?

A: Yes.

Q: Is a real-life interface through the Federal Response Plan and National Response Center

being planned?

A: No. Also, the National Contingency Plan is not integrated either.

The participants request the following two actions be addressed by the Army, FEMA and the States: (1) Assistance is needed for the Umatilla claims attorney to develop a plan for responding on behalf of the Army to legal issues raised by CSEPP; and (2) The Federal Response Plan, National Contingency Plan, and others should have a bridge document available to facilitate a coordinated response. The Army, FEMA, and state representatives agreed to raise the issues to the appropriate individuals.

Medical

Tuesday, June 30, and Wednesday, July 1, 1998
3:30 PM and 10:00 AM

Summary of Presentation by Jim Aldridge, Alabama

Mr. Aldridge, Alabama Emergency Management Agency, gave a briefing on the techniques Alabama utilized to encourage participation, attendance, and interest in training. They had to face the problem of training a large population of volunteer responders, so training was tailored to meet the needs and time constraints of those volunteers. A shotgun approach was used to conduct the training not only for the Emergency Medical Services (EMS) responders, but drivers and their spouses. Incentives, such as pins to wear on their uniforms, were used to show people had taken this specialized training as a way to encourage others to participate. Over 2,000 people have taken this training.

Summary of Presentation by Dick Haas, Alabama

Mr. Haas, Alabama Department of Public Health, gave an overview of the training for medical providers in 13 different counties within the state. CSEPP training is offered in different formats to accommodate the needs of the providers. Some training is conducted in either one hour sessions, three hour sessions, or full day sessions. The primary goal of the training program is to train hospital staffs and other community medical providers who may support the hospital staff. Mr Haas gave an overview of the curriculum developed and used by Science Applications International Corporation (SAIC) to conduct medical training. The training program began as a train-the-trainer concept that trained 55 personnel who, in turn, began to train others. Alabama still needs additional teams trained and to develop a comprehensive medical training schedule.

Summary of Presentation by Dr. Richard Alcorta, Maryland

Dr. Richard Alcorta, Maryland CSEPP and State EMS Medical Director, gave a presentation entitled: "Exercising Your Hospitals: How to 'Encourage' Training and Participation." It stressed the importance of each of the following points: 1) how medical training is integrated into exercises and drills; 2) scope of play; 3) stressing the system; 4) exercise participants; 5) evaluation process;

6) hot wash, not a white wash, and a written critique; and 7) driving the critique home (through political bodies, media, and hospital CEOs). He used the unannounced exercise that was conducted at a Maryland hospital on April 1, 1998 to illustrate his points. The exercise was conducted as an "exercise within an exercise" in conjunction with the annual CSEPP exercise. Dr. Alcorta gave an additional "Food for Thought" discussion on contaminated food/commerce resources and veterinary resources of antidotes for pets and livestock. He further raised the following question: How does the system deal with family pets that people will not leave? No answers were given, but a need to look at these issues is real and needs to be included in future exercises.

Summary of Presentation by Joe Herring, FEMA

Joe Herring distributed and briefly discussed *CSEPP Policy Paper #15, Off-Post Medical Preparedness*. He also distributed technical papers, *Medical Screening for Evacuees* and *Use of Cholinesterase Determinations in CSEPP*. Both of the latter two documents have been previously distributed within the CSEPP community, beginning in 1996.

Modeling

Wednesday, July 1, 1998
8:00 AM and 1:30 PM

Summary of Presentation by Mike Myirski, Army

Mike Myirski, U. S. Army CBDCOM, presented a historic overview of modeling and explained the primary use of the modeling program in CSEPP. He explained that D2PC continues to be used for hazard analysis of proposed operations, establishing the CSEPP zones, preparing the risk profiles of continued storage, and on-site storage and transportation to an incinerator. The model is also used for evaluating proposed protective action measures. The model's results indicate how much value is gained by various protective measures. The model is also used for daily operations planning at the storage sites and would be used in the response phase if there were a Chemical Accident/Incident Response and Assistance (CAIRA) situation. He then explained the D2 Puff Model being developed by IEM. While D2PC is a plume model that assumes steady state atmospheric conditions, it cannot handle a wind direction shift. A Puff model breaks up the plume into separate "puffs" and treats each puff separately. The model effort was initiated in 1996. A beta version was developed and tested at Blue Grass, Anniston, and Pine Bluff. It was favorably received at Blue Grass while Anniston thought that the model should have been farther along in development before testing. A release version will be developed for Independent Verification and Validation (IVV) in August. Dugway Proving Ground Meteorology Division will conduct the IVV. If the IVV goes well, the model will be provided to the Department of the Army for review and accreditation. It will be Spring 1999 before the model could be installed in the field. The model is more intensive and requires more thought and training on the part of the hazard analyst. The U.S. Army Defense Ammunition

Center (USADAC) will probably do the training. The model will continue to provide a conservative prediction. It is predictive only, and does not display what may actually be in the environment.

Summary of Presentation by Dr. Steve Stage, Innovative Emergency Management, Inc.

Steve Stage, Innovative Emergency Management, Inc. (IEM), stated that D2PC is a straight line Gaussian plume model. It cannot consider space or time changes in meteorology. It can provide overly conservative hazard distances. The Puff Model was developed to address these limitations. It is intended to model accidental releases of chemical agents. It will provide concentration, peak concentration, dosages and time to dosage for unprotected persons. It is fully compatible with D2PC/PARDOS. Currently, it is a stand-alone Windows application. It is designed to use a user friendly Graphical User Interface. It can be incorporated into EMIS or FEMIS. The IVV will be initiated in late Summer. It contains data for the Army chemical weapons. Sample runs were demonstrated. With wind direction shifts, the plume footprint is much more complex than the simple plume footprint of D2PC. The maximum hazard distances are reduced. The changes are determined by the actual met data. The model can handle any number of wind observations for any number of times. The user of the Puff Model can set the concentrations and dosages of interest. The model has the ability to have forecast data input. The primary variables are wind speed, direction, and height of the mixing layer. The model will use all available met data and forecasts for a run. It is a four dimensional model, with three dimensions of space plus one in time. Terrain applies to wind blowing around hills, etc. Topography refers to changes in height of the plume above the surface. Currently, the model will not consider topography. The model will consider variations of wind speed by different heights and location. Dave Holm, Colorado EMA, stated that Colorado has a Colorado Department of Public Health and Environment and U.S. Department of Energy (DOE) certified model that they would like to get up and running for off-post planning, for both response and recovery. Mr. Myirski indicated that the Colorado/DOE model is two dimensional and does not use the vertical component. Mr. Holm indicated that the vertical component portion has been added, but the model does not address rain-out, which will affect the recovery effort.

Q: Will training for Depot Hazard Analysts be available?
A: Mr. Myirski stated that training would become available in Summer 1999.

Q: Is there a terrain feature in D2-Puff?
A: There is a terrain feature in D2-Puff but it will not take into account things such as drainage winds and open fields.

Q: Will D2-Puff also be going to the off-post communities?
A: Mr. Myirski stated that he planned to provide D2-Puff to both the on-post and off-post communities.

Off-Post Monitoring
Wednesday, July 1, 1998
Time: 8:00 AM and 3:30 PM

Summary of Presentation by Bill Burger, Kentucky

Bill Burger, Kentucky Environmental Response Team, introduced the Off-Post Monitoring IPT process, which began in February 1997. He noted that the IPT product was draft guidance, not policy. It is still under review, and, therefore, is not being distributed. However, the draft document is available on the CSEPP website at http://csepp.apgea.army.mil. Several critical assumptions were made during its development. They are: 1) monitoring is only a tool, not an end in itself; 2) monitoring will never prove the absence of agent, just take measurements up to equipment detection limits; 3) monitoring should be used in conjunction with air dispersion modeling; 4) monitoring equipment and operations may impact operator safety; and 5) monitoring can be used to determine contamination existence, to determine the need for decontamination, to determine appropriate work rules, to determine when to egress from protective shelters or evacuated areas, or to assist in making various other decisions. A number of parameters apply to selecting monitoring equipment for CSEPP, such as storage requirements, power requirements, need for user training, cost, and others. The conclusions that were drawn include: 1) site-specific monitoring agreements should be developed; 2) monitoring resources will always be limited; 3) monitoring should be exercised and a specific methodology developed; 4) identifying which decisions are required based on monitoring is a critical prerequisite for selecting monitoring equipment; and 5) monitoring equipment requires considerable training to use.

Q: Was the IPT aware of the equipment being developed for Domestic Preparedness?
A: Yes. Kevin Kammerer, CBDCOM, indicated that the IPT used available resources to capture information on equipment.

Q: This sounds like the states may do their own monitoring. Will the Army make their equipment available?
A: Dennis Legel, CBDCOM, said that there have been no changes in policy. The IPT was set up because some states have shown an interest in doing some monitoring on their own. Dan Feighert said that this was for states that may want to have a capability beyond what CSEPP provides.

Q: Army equipment uses live agent to calibrate. Many communities do not want this in their community. Are there instruments that do not require agent?
A: Dan Feighert said there are some instruments that do not need agent. There is a trade off between capabilities of the equipment and the detection levels.

Q: Was a crosswalk developed between the monitoring report and all CSEPP guidance?
A: A crosswalk to all CSEPP guidance was not developed; however, other guidance was considered.

Summary of Presentation by Ken Miodovski, Army

Ken Miodovski of the U.S. Army Center for Health Promotion and Preventive Medicine (CHPPM) discussed sampling plans. Under DA Pam-50-6, the Army is responsible for recovery, and sampling is part of that process. The prototype plan CHPPM developed was based on a Pine Bluff exercise. While it includes many things, it is not a site-specific plan, it does not represent Army policy, and it is not the only way to do sampling. A number of items are included in sampling plans, such as sampling strategy. At Pine Bluff, four overlay zones were developed within the IRZ, based on likely deposition density. In a remote area, fewer samples would be needed, but a populated area would need many. Media to be sampled include sediment, wipes, surface water, indoor air, biological (including outside the modeled area), and various miscellaneous materials. To complement grid sampling, specific additional areas may be sampled, such as day care centers or agricultural crops. The number of samples depends on the size of the release and the grid density. Sampling should be statistically-based and zone-dependent, with more dense sampling nearer to the release point. Areas outside the initial grid may also need sampling, depending on what is encountered in the field. Sampling is for the purpose of detecting chemical warfare agents and key breakdown products. Equipment detection limits define sampling goals, rather than methodology, e.g., a contamination limit. Background sampling is not required because such data can be determined after a release. A quality control laboratory is necessary. The Army is developing health-based screening levels to enable identification of hot spots and clear zones. Sampling must be prioritized in order to clear critical areas as soon as possible. Extreme weather conditions would be difficult to sample because they cannot be modeled or predicted. The number of samples required might be potentially significant and could impact time lines. The current methods are unable to meet the screening levels presently under consideration. In order to prepare a sampling plan, planners need to identify background information, demographics, geography in the area, a laboratory, a quality assurance plan, a process for obtaining concurrence by appropriate government agencies (e.g., the states, EPA, or the Army), resources, and a site safety and health plan. In real time, sampling ideally should take less than a week. In summary, the process presented here can be a blueprint for sampling and analysis. It is flexible, scientifically based, utilizes Geographical Information System/Global Positioning System (GIS/GPS), and bases decisions on health-based screening levels.

PIO Public Awareness Workshop

Tuesday, June 30, 1998 and Wednesday, July, 1, 1998

1:30 and 3:30PM - 10:00 AM and 1:30 PM (Sessions were concurrent)

Summary of Presentations by Steve Horwitz, FEMA and Kathy Gibbs, Army

Mr. Horwitz and Ms. Gibbs discussed the upcoming Public Awareness Survey. They defined public awareness to mean that someone knows: that the CSEP Program purpose is to prepare the community for chemical emergency with such physical things as an EOC; what to do in the event of an emergency – – evacuate or shelter in place, and they know what each means; and what to do when the sirens sound. The last survey showed the level of public awareness among the eight sites is between 15-35 percent. Participants wanted information on who had conducted the survey; how it

was prepared; and who was included in the survey (IRZ, PAZ and/or others). A new combined PMCD/CSEPP survey is being developed. The University of Arizona will conduct the polls and provide the validation. Concerns were raised that residents who will be polled might have questions that the poll takers could not answer. In addition, there is concern that public affairs funding will be allocated based on survey results; when a site has done a good job getting the message out, then that site will not get future funds. The following other comments and questions were also raised: CSEPP PAOs need to be on survey team; why are locals and outreach folks not trying to get some synergy?; what percentage of survey questions will be CSEPP related?; how will survey questions be constructed?; what is the timeline for the survey?; what is the time required to complete the survey?; what will be done with the survey results?; will funding be provided to answer concerns / implement fixes?; how will the survey results affect the PAZ community?; and has funding for this project been approved in light of the fact that the state directors had been advised about future cuts in CSEPP? It was stated that Mr. Fisher and Mr. Salter approved the strategy conceptually, but they wanted feedback from conference participants. Other comments voiced by participants include: they are not interested in a PR program, but are interested in public education; they want local control of money to develop local programs; CSEPP needs to recognize the expertise of CSEPP by highlighting first responders; and an equity formula (funding public information/education) could be established.

Summary of Presentation by Steve Horwitz, FEMA and Kathy Gibbs, Army

Mr. Horwitz and Ms. Gibbs provided information about the draft public affairs plan, entitled *Public Awareness Campaign for Promoting CSEPP in the Stockpile Communities*. Ms. Gibbs stated that the plan is for the Army, FEMA and FEMA Regions. It is designed to target things that can be done on a national level. It is not a plan for states and locals, but it is important to let the states and locals know what is happening. The strategy is to retain an advertising agency to develop a marketing campaign designed to double the awareness of CSEPP. The advertising campaign would be sensitive to issues and concerns of all eight sites. The messages to be conveyed are: 1) "Your community is better prepared because of CSEPP"; 2) "Your neighbors are part of the CSEPP team"; 3) "CSEPP benefits will remain in your community"; and 4) "The preferred protective action in a chemical event is evacuation. However, if evacuation is neither practical nor possible, shelter-in-place will protect you until you can evacuate or until the emergency is over"

The participants raised many concerns and suggestions including: the theme should be what people should do to protect themselves; a community might be upset about Army/FEMA money being spent for commercials; different audiences need different messages; which TV stations would be used; commercials could raise concerns with people that would not be affected; how would funds be distributed?; how would messages be developed?; national vs. local approach; the need to be cautious about the amount of money we spend talking about the success of the program; the need for flexibility to spend the money in such a way to best reach each sites's target audience (e.g., marketing the calendar before the calendar is issued); commercials in the certain markets (e.g., Baltimore) would reach more than the CSEPP population; and the need for a Power Point presentation that PIOs can take to civic groups to provide flexibility in presentation.

Copies of the site-specific inserts for the CSEPP brochure were distributed for review and

comment. Ms. Gibbs announced that they were moving forward on videos and regional newsletters. As an example, Mike Howard, FEMA Region X PIO, stated that the Region has written monthly news releases highlighting what CSEPP has done for the community. The news releases focus on partnership and cooperation among the state, local, and Federal officials. During Disaster Preparedness Month, Region X used the FEMA Radio Network to air five or six quotations from different local and state officials -- these were made available to the radio stations. News releases go on the FEMA web page (www.fema.gov), as well as to media. The participants raised the following suggestions about the videos: that they need to be site specific; and that evacuation and shelter-in-place videos address animals, special needs populations, collective protection, and instructing young children at home alone on how to evacuate.

Mr. Horwitz announced that FEMA will be designating CSEPP Public Affairs points of contact (POCs). Participants had not heard about this initiative and asked why the regional PIOs did not fill this role. Mr. Horwitz explained that the PIOs had other responsibilities, such as disaster response, in addition to CSEPP. Once identified, Mr. Horwitz will meet with the CSEPP POCs to explain their roles and responsibilities such as increasing the role of PIO regional support at exercises and escorting real world media along with Army PAOs during exercises.

Ms. Gibbs announced that the PA Conference to be held in Seattle on December 2-3, 1998 and will be open to non-PA staff as well as to PA staff.

PPE/Decon
Tuesday, June 30, and Wednesday, July 1, 1998
1:30 PM and 10:00 AM

Summary of Presentation by Colonel George Becker, Utah National Guard

Colonel Becker, Utah National Guard, outlined the personal protective equipment (PPE) acquisition process through the Guard system. A letter would be required from the Army Material Command to authorize acquisition through State Guard. Procurement would be on a reimbursement basis. He recommend comparing acquisition through the Guard and the Depot to determine which agency would be higher on the Army equipment access list before making a decision regarding acquisition. Training funds need to come from the state to pay for the National Guard to train people to use the PPE because it is not legal to use federal training dollars for this purpose.

Summary of Presentation by Lloyd Baker, Utah

Lloyd Baker, Utah Department of Health, stated that nine hospitals are using the training available at Aberdeen Proving Ground. Utah's concept calls for setting up triage centers away from the hospitals to screen, decon, and determine medical needs to avoid overtaxing hospitals. About 750 antidote kits have been distributed to first responders. It was necessary to change Utah law to allow certain responders to carry and use Mark 1 kits.

Q: How much training is needed for issue of kits?
A: They use a video presentation.

Q: Who is authorized to have the kits?
A: Only people at TCPs in Tooele County are authorized.

Q: To whom do they administer the antidote?
A: Only to themselves.

Q: Why triage rather than reception centers?
A: They use initial triage to save hospital space for the injured. They set up triage as close to the site as possible.

Q: How do you get word out on the location of the triage areas?
A: The state establishes and publicizes the locations by distance from the site.

Q: How did you handle medical screening required before training and how did you pay for it?
A: Since most responders were not designated hazmat responders, the expensive physicals were not required. If they are designated hazmat responders, then they are funded through other means for the physicals. Different routes may have to be explored to get people, especially volunteers, to take the physicals and to fund them. Changing designation of personnel so they are not classified as first responders can also lower requirements. The FEMA authorization for the suit also has enough extra dollars to cover the cost of the lower level physicals.

Q: What are the physical requirements for volunteer fire departments that may be required to wear self-contained breathing apparatus (SCBA)?
A: Generally the funding is provided by the fire department when there is a routine requirement to wear SCBA. This funding is for physicals and training. Often, how you decide to employ your people determines the training and physical requirements.

Summary of Presentation by George Krock, Maryland

George Krock, Maryland CSEPP Program Manager, stated that the threat in Maryland is vapor only. Maryland uses the one-size-fits-all concept, with all the equipment carried in one bag. Equipment includes a powered air-purifying respirator (PAPR), a hood, a blue Responder suit, and oversize gloves and boots. The PAPR battery and filters are in sealed bags. Monthly inspections are accomplished on the clothing and PAPR. The battery is inspected and resealed in the plastic bag annually. Developing or identifying better methods to package and extend equipment shelf life would reduce maintenance problems. These are two concepts that are being looked at in Maryland. Questions raised during the session included:

Q: What about sizing with one-size-fits-all in the case of people five feet tall versus people

six feet tall?

A: All wear it anyway.

Q: What about masks being the same size?

A: The protection comes from the combination of the hood and plastic face mask.

Q: What is the protection factor (PF) on the mask?

A: The PF on the mask is 25 and 50 on the PAPR.

Q: Is there a minimum protection factor?

A: No, but the lower it is, the more limited concentrations that you can work in. You need to check with your state OSHA to see what they will approve.

Q: How much training is needed on the equipment?

A: Only a small amount. To reduce battery replacement problems, they use NICAD batteries for training.

Q: What face mask are you using?

A: The Racal Breathe Easy 10, with choice of batteries.

Q: What is the cost of all the equipment in the bag?

A: $500 for the bag and all the equipment.

Q: What about problems with oversize gloves and boots in terms of mobility and tactility?

A: Trade-offs to provide for coverage.

Q: What about decon?

A: Because the threat is vapor only we do not wet decon. Maryland does dry decon by peeling off the suit.

Q: Is monitoring going on? What about the OSHA requirement on the 19% oxygen level and knowing what is there?

A: We (Maryland) will not enter our 40 degree wedge. Utah will use EOC projections.

Q: How do you know when to change the filter because there is no service life indicator on the mask?.

A: Filters are changed after each use.

Q: How many of sets of equipment do you have?

A: Sixty-five at the state level and 350 at the county level.

Q: How do you get suits for training?

A: Suits used for real events are the Responder; less expensive suits are used for training. May relook at issue since the price of the Responder has come down. From a funding

standpoint, 20% overage is provided for training and other miscellaneous items.

Summary of Presentation by Rob Weiss, Army

Rob Weiss, CBDCOM, provided an update on the currently approved types of commercial PPE, including PAPRs and suits. Currently, four PAPRs (MSA Optimair 6a, RACAL BE 7 and the BE 10 with hood, and the Surviar 5400) and two suits are approved. A third suit is being looked at for the mustard-only threat. The list of approved Army PPE is virtually unchanged. To order PPE through the Army, the request must come from the county to state then to FEMA (cy to CBDCOM) to the Army. An authorization number (DODAC) can be obtained through the Defense Logistics Agency. Equipment can be delivered to Guard or non-military addresses. However, it works best for delivery to an Army address because the Army system is not set up to track piecemeal delivery to non-military addresses.

Summary of Presentation by Herman Herrera, Utah

Herman Herrera , Tooele County, Utah, described PPE battery maintenance and the lessons learned during the full scale exercise about using, distributing, and maintaining the equipment. The county includes CSEPP PPE training in regular and HAZMAT training. They have learned that using seals on the packages can minimize maintenance costs. If equipment is returned still sealed, then it does not have to be checked as carefully. Mr. Herrera recommended using lithium batteries for operational situations and NiCad batteries for training because they can be recharged. Lithium batteries last 10 years with a one time-use restriction.

Q: How much equipment do you have?
A: 250 sets in Tooele county.

Q: What equipment are you using?
A: The Responder, a PAPR, and a mobile trailer with equipment that included gross decon equipment.

Q: Any problems with heat in the trailer?
A: No, the insulation keeps the temperature reasonable.

Q: Does your training use 1910.120 as a guide?
A: Yes. We use an 8 hour level of training for hospitals. Lloyd Baker stated SAIC does training in the medical area. The County has trained approximately 1000 responders, but the turnover rate for personnel is high. The state had been trying to hold 2 training cycles per year. They prefer to send people to Aberdeen Proving Ground for detailed medical training.

Q: How do you return excess or expired shelf life battle dress overgarments (BDOs) to the Army?
A: There is no need to return them. However, we use them for training or discard them.

Project Management Demonstration
Tuesday, June 30, and Wednesday, July 1, 1998
3:30 and 1:30 PM

Summary of Presentation by Steve DeBow, Washington

Mr. Steve Debow, Washington State Emergency Management Division, provided a case study on how Microsoft Project software is used as a tool to successfully manage the Washington CSEPP. He said the Washington CSEPP community began the process by identifying completion of systemization of the Umatilla chemical disposal plant as an end point. They then had to agree on final benchmarks which were: plans in place; level of training/exercise; equipment for automation; equipment for communications; equipment for alert/warning; and level of public awareness. They also had to agree on the evaluation process and deal with such questions as: what is an appropriate level of preparedness?; how will preparedness be evaluated?; and what format will be used? They used backward planning and determined how long each activity would take, which activities can run concurrently, and which activities are on a critical path. In using Microsoft Project, they set up a Regional file, identified the end point, set up standard categories of activities, identified milestones (completed actions), tasked appropriate levels to complete and maintain details, and met regularly to track progress. Mr. DeBow also talked about links to their annual CA proposal which included: identifying costs based on their work plan; incorporating identification of cost items; and tracking costs based on awards through project completion.

Summary of Presentation by Steve Reaves, FEMA

Mr. Steve Reaves, FEMA Region VIII, provided a case study on how Microsoft Project software is used as a tool to successfully manage the Colorado CSEPP program. He explained that the decision to use Project Manager in Colorado was based on the fact that many projects were involved in executing CSEPP in Colorado. He also explained that project management is the application of techniques, skills, tools, and knowledge of project activities in order to meet or exceed stakeholder needs and expectations from a project. He stated that the following management knowledge areas are necessary for successful project management: integration management; scope management; time management; cost management; quality management; human resource management; communication management; risk management; and procurement management. The processes used are initiating, planning, executing, controlling, and closing. The phases of their project management consists of: project plan, which takes the results of other planning processes and puts them into a consistent, coherent document; project plan execution, which carries out the project plan by performing the activities included in the project plan; and updating the project plan, which develops and maintains the project plan. Common terms used in the Colorado plan include: baseline, the original plan, critical path (the series of activities which determines the earliest completion of the project), Gantt Chart (a bar chart defining schedule related information), and milestone, a significant event in the project, usually completion of a major deliverable. He closed his presentation by showing an example of how Project Manager was used to manage the procurement of TARs.

Recovery

Tuesday, June 30 and Wednesday, July 1, 1998
1:30 PM and 10:00 AM

The Recovery IPT has not yet been completely formed, so members other than Dan Feighert and Kevin Kammerrer were not available to represent the Recovery IPT. However, in anticipation of the formation of the Recovery IPT in the future, the facilitators asked the attendees for subjects that the IPT should consider. A general discussion ensued that identified the following subjects as areas for the IPT's consideration:

- Be sure all interested parties are represented in the IP, including federal agencies;
- Clarify the application of recovery to CSEPP;
- Define recovery, and contrast it with response phase actions;
- Separate the technical issues of recovery from the political considerations in order to break recovery planning down to manageable pieces;
- Provide a generic guide for recovery protocols that will not be site-specific nor carry the force of regulation;
- Develop a bridging document between CSEPP guidance and the National Contingency Plan (NCP) as well as the Federal Response Plan (FRP);
- Clarify the actual role and responsibilities of the on-scene coordinator (OSC) under the NCP;
- Address how the Stafford Act would affect the process in the event of a Presidential Declaration, and how it would affect tort claims;
- Consider planning already done by some jurisdictions, such as Utah and Colorado and the results of the recent Umatilla Reentry and Recovery Workshop;
- Use exercises to encourage recovery planning;
- Consider whether there is off-post deposition;
- Consider recovery exercise objectives that might come out of the Exercise IPT, rather than the Recovery IPT;
- Discuss Army SRF authority for recovery;
- Discuss FEMA’s role in recovery;
- Conduct a recovery plan writing workshop;
- Ensure that local recovery plans are subject to appropriate peer review;
- Develop recovery plans consistent with HAZMAT plans to the extent possible;
- Identify any new technologies available for mitigating recovery problems;
- Develop recovery checklists;
- Cover all relevant public health and safety issues;
- Prioritize use of scarce monitoring capabilities;
- Describe who has jurisdiction for recovery operations;
- Address responsibilities for cleanup and disposition of waste products; and
- Identify recovery benchmarks.

Regulatory Perspective/Readiness Assessment
Tuesday, June 30, and Wednesday, July 1, 1998
1:30 PM

Summary of Presentation by Leo Coonradt, Utah

These sessions provided a review of *The CSEPP Readiness Certification Briefing Manual* and its contents. Mr. Leo Coonradt, Deputy Director, Utah CEM, explained that this is a "how-to-book" based on the State of Utah's process for assessing readiness based on its experience in preparing for the incineration system at Tooele. The State Emergency Director had to certify the State was ready. It was suggested that the nine remaining CSEPP states should follow a similar process.

The RCRA permit was the driver for the Director certifying off-post "readiness." The Governor appointed a cabinet-level CSEPP Council to review readiness and determine acceptability to begin the trial burn. A Readiness Assessment Form was developed as a tool to evaluate overall readiness of participating jurisdictions. The CSEPP exercise objectives were chosen as the basis for evaluation and survey additional elements were added. Each of 15 components was evaluated as ready, not-ready; or not applicable based on point rating of 1 (not ready)-10 (99% ready) with an average score of seven signifying readiness. The goal was to achieve scores of 10 for each component under "maximum protection." Survey orientation, briefing, and training were conducted for the subject experts doing the evaluations, and consensus was to be reached for each element.

The Preliminary Assessment revealed several jurisdictions at a "not-ready" status. Intense negotiations then occurred between the Army, FEMA, the State of Utah, and the IRZ county as to the means for reaching readiness. Agreement was reached between the Army, FEMA, and IRZ and PAZ counties that funding necessary for preparedness measures would continue and that all would strive for maximum protection. The National Research Council was brought in to review risk of storage and disposal as part of the readiness assessment. The Governor's CSEPP Policy Council briefed the Governor on the CSEPP state of readiness and recommended the permit be issued. The Governor concurred with the recommendation and the CEM Director signed the letter attesting to off-post preparedness at a state of readiness. The permit was approved by the Utah Department of Environmental Quality for the Army to begin test burns at the TOCDF. The permit was challenged in court but two courts held that the permit was valid and the test burn could continue. The Readiness Assessment continues today on a monthly basis.

CSEPP Resource Management
Tuesday, June 30, and Wednesday July 1, 1998
1:30 PM and 10:00 AM

Summary of Presentation by Peggy Stahl, FEMA Headquarters

Ms. Stahl outlined the federal budget process pointing out that it is a very lengthy and time

consuming process. The President's budget takes nine months to prepare and is submitted to Congress 15 months before the year in which the appropriation is made. The federal agency's budget is submitted to OMB for review. CSEPP funds are provided through the DoD budget. Therefore, FEMA and CSEPP must meet requirements imposed by DoD. When required, FEMA can provide additional information to OMB. Appeals are sent to the President for resolution. CSEPP does not receive non-stockpile funds, although the Non-Stockpile Program does have a separate budget. There are two types of appropriations, operations and maintenance (O&M) funds and Procurement funds. Each type of appropriation has its own restrictions regarding its use; O&M funds have a one year life cycle, while procurement funds have a life cycle of three years.

The annual cooperative agreement (CA) is used for the administration and oversight of the approved budget. Funding requests must be in compliance with established procedures and policies; within program objectives; and must be reasonable, allowable, and appropriate. CSEPP funds, at FEMA, may not be co-mingled with other, non-CSEPP funds and must be kept within the intent of the appropriations. It is hoped that in 1999 funds would be reserved for FEMA and FEMA would be allowed to make decisions about funding. It is planned to make all funding decisions by FEMA at the Regional level. Guidance and instructions will be provided by FEMA Headquarters concerning budget development. Input / updates to the budget can be made by the individual counties and states in coordination with the regions. FEMA will receive the funds once the President's budget is signed and will make appropriate distribution to the regions for further distribution to the states and counties.

In response to a question, Ms. Stahl explained that cost-sharing occurs when facilities or equipment, originally purchased with CSEPP funds, are maintained using CSEPP and other program funds (especially when the other programs have derived some quantifiable benefit from the CSEPP equipment or facility). A county representative expressed concern that there is an increased push to increase the level of cost-sharing. This is especially problematic because some counties entered the program with expectations that their needs would be met by CSEPP. If increases of cost-sharing are required, the counties need more lead time to allow them to react and formulate new budget practices. A concern was also expressed that CSEPP has derived benefit from non-CSEPP resources and that this issue has not been adequately addressed by CSEPP. A concern about how the program endpoint will affect state and county emergency management budgets was also raised.

Program Performance Monitoring (PPM) is a management tool used by FEMA. PPM identifies long-term capability requirements, tracks programmatic capability improvements, and facilitates working with the states and local governments to achieve programmatic goals and move toward financial accountability. Microsoft Project Management is the software program used as the monitoring tool for PPM.

The CSEPP Benchmarks serve as a basis for funding decisions, establishing program priorities, and assessing operational capabilities. The benchmarks are:

- Alert and Notification
- Automated Data Processing System

- Communication System
- Community Involvement Program
- Coordinated Plans
- Emergency Operations Center
- Exercise Program
- Personnel
- Training Program

All the budget process pieces (benchmarks, program guidance, budget requests, program accomplishments, in-process reviews, project tracking, etc.) fit together to form a total budget and program management perspective. There is a potential for future additional oversight and scrutiny from GAO requiring FEMA justification and testimony. A solid budget and management system will make it possible to effectively respond to GAO. FEMA provides periodic briefings and updates to congressional delegations approximately every three months.

Summary of Presentation by Lisa Craven, FEMA Headquarters.

Lisa Craven, CSEPP Resource Manager FEMA Headquarters (HQ), presented a description of plans for the FY 99 CSEPP Budget Process. The process involves:

- guidance from FEMA Headquarters
- budget negotiations
- funding recommendations forwarded to FEMA HQs
- preliminary notification
- Presidential approval of appropriations act
- final (award) notification

FEMA HQ is using the life-cycle cost estimate (LCCE) baseline to justify and support CSEPP funding requirements, as well as, responses to Congressional reviews and queries. LCCE has provided leverage for FEMA HQ in supporting program requirements. The CSEP Program is faced with budget cuts due to overall budget reductions. Costs must be reasonable and justified based on realistic requirements and needs. A memorandum has been sent to the Regions and jurisdictions that provide the LCCE funding amounts for FY 1999. Jurisdictions expressed concern over not being informed of the exact funding distribution for their respective LCCE baselines. Attendees felt it was very important to have this information in a more timely manner for effective resource management. Budget requests and federal funding applications on a diskette are due to the regions by July 15, 1998 for review and comment.

FEMA HQ will look on a macro level at budget requests in comparison to funds appropriated and provide preliminary notification to the Regions in regard to projected funding levels. Once the President's budget is signed, final award notification will be provided to the Regions. Actual funds will be provided to FEMA HQ approximately three weeks after the budget act is signed. Follow-on funding will be provided to the Regions as soon as possible. Regions will then provide funding to

their various jurisdictions. Comments emphasized that the budget process is extremely time consuming and is dependent upon the national budgetary process, of which the CSEP Program is but an extremely small entity.

Summary of Presentations by Jim Vercellone and Jon Zadra, Argonne National Laboratory

Mr. Vercellone presented a walk-through of the enhanced Version 3.0b of the CSEPP CA Database Module. The version attempted to incorporate comments received from states and counties. Version 3.0b was created to ensure compatibility of the Module with Windows 95, Windows NT, and eventually Windows 98. Mr. Zadra reviewed enhancements in Version 3.0b. Installing 3.0b will not uninstall prior versions. Installed size of the database is about 15 megabytes. To facilitate answering questions about the Module 3.0b, hyperlinks to both Mr. Zadra's and Mr. Vercellone's mailboxes have been added.

New capabilities include the ability to print a single worksheet rather than the entire report, all columns in 3.0b, selectively editing items by entering the identification number, and spell checking of any block text boxes. Additional capabilities include enhanced sort features when reports come up for preview; a new print option box; capability to capture the narrative portion of the report in a word-processing format; enhanced unfunded items report capability; and addition of a CSEPP report wizard to facilitate creation of state or local customized reports from existing reports. Some general concerns were expressed about the lack of user-friendliness of the Module.

Training
Tuesday, June 30 and Wedensday July 1, 1998
3:30 PM

Summary of Presentation by Wyatt Colclasure, CBDCOM

Wyatt Colclasure, CBDCOM, provided an overview of administrative matters and medical training provided by the U.S. Army to the off-post community. He stated that more emphasis is currently being given to exercise preparation and support, rather than formal classroom training. During FY9 1998, the medical support being given through a contract with SAIC has also shifted to provide greater effort in exercise support and evaluation. Their statement of work for FY 1999 will probably continue this trend of active support in exercises activities.

Summary of Presentation by Robert Norville, FEMA, Headquarters

Robert Norville, FEMA Headquarters, CSEPP Training Coordinator, updated the audience on CSEPP training and new initiatives at a national and State level. An introduction to the expanded training Web site was provided. The Web site offers five responder training courses: CSEPP Chemical Awareness, ACT FAST, Decontamination, Personal Protective Equipment, and Auto Injectors. Command and Control CD ROMs were introduced and are available for use by all jurisdictions. The latest training initiative is the CSEPP First Responder Video, targeted to Arkansas first responders. Arkansas first responders have a legislated mandate to allow them to use auto injectors on those persons exposed to agent. While the video will meet the needs for recertification of Arkansas first responders, it will be generic enough for use in all other states.

CSEPP training course materials are being provided to the National Technical Information Service (U.S. Department of Commerce) for distribution to the public. This approach was taken in response to the large request for emergency training materials from outside the CSEPP community, partly due to an increasing interest and applicability related to national terrorism concerns. A database is being maintained of evaluations of CSEPP courses by those who have taken them. This database allows for statistical assessment of CSEPP courses.

Summary of Presentation by George Ziener, NTIS

Mr. George Ziener, Director, National Audiovisual Center, National Technical Information Service (NTIS), (george@zeiner.com), described the continued expansion of the NTIS into emergency planning resources and electronic media. NTIS works on a cost recovery basis. It is an access point to reach the over 96,000 government reports received annually. It is also a point of production resources, contact for resource location, and research. Navy Corpsman and Department of Health training materials can be acquired through this service. It has built an extensive library of training materials from OSHA, FEMA, DOD, DOE, and other Federal and State agencies.

Summary of Presentation by John Winter, USADAC

John Winter, U.S. Army Defense Ammunition Center, Savanna, Illinois, provided an update on the CSEPP training courses being offered. Five instructors provide training both on-site and off-site. The CSEPP training program activities will continue to be presented in Illinois while being relocated to McAlester, Oklahoma.

Summary of Presentation by Joseph Bell, Indiana

Joseph Bell, CSEPP Exercise Training Officer, State of Indiana, provided an overview of the State Emergency Management Information System (SEMIS), specifically Emergency Task and Response Tracking System (TracSys). A major issue has been how to train volunteers and people assigned from other agencies to effectively operate emergency planning software during an emergency situation. One major feature of TracSys is its resource database component where, for example, the names and addresses of contacts, from whom batteries and blankets can be quickly acquired, are identified. In addition, directories are also available, such as for all Indiana county directors. The reason for this adjustment to SEMIS was to expand its capability to respond to all hazards. It is critical to provide a "job aid" in the automation system to assist those who use the system intermittently. The system provides a user-friendly glossary, message function to transmit and respond to resource requests, and resource allocation and dispersal tracking.

Wally Wise Guy
Wednesday, July 1, 1998
8:00 AM and 3:30 PM

These sessions were four member panel discussions about the successes and lessons learned in working with Wally Wise Guy, the shelter-in-place turtle mascot.

Summary of Presentation by Dan Lonai, Oregon

Mr. Lonai, Umatilla System Administrator/Network Manager, demonstrated a kiosk containing an animated computer program that uses Wally Wise Guy as host. The program is in English or Spanish. Categories of information within the kiosk program are: "Umatilla Chemical Depot"; "What should I do?"; "How will I be warned?"; and "How can I prepare?" Umatilla hopes to add touch-screen capability so that people can move through the programs with greater ease. The cost of the Wally suit is $3,500 plus an additional $650 for the carrying case.

Mr. Lonai then demonstrated the interactive web page featuring Wally Wise Guy, in English and Spanish. The web site has educational movies, a community calendar, a fun page, and an interactive shelter-in-place program. A screen has been created, and they hope to distribute it on diskette to school children.

Summary of Presentation by Tom Groat, Umatilla County

Mr. Groat discussed use of the Wally character. Wally has been a very good tool for his community at fairs, parades, and rodeos. It is a great vehicle to get out a difficult message. The suit is very hot, the costume must be dry cleaned, stickers stick to the shell. There have been problems with the fire department about possible message conflicts. Wally's message is to go inside for a chemical incident while the fire prevention message is to leave the building. The Fire Chief and PIO discussed the conflicts and worked it out to the satisfaction of both groups.

Summary of Presentation by Bob Brown, Indiana

Bob Brown, PIO, Vermillion County, Indiana, discussed the use of Wally in the Newport area. They found that Wally works well with fourth graders and younger. Older children turn Wally into a "punching bag". Wally's "real identity" must be kept a secret from the children; this also means he cannot talk. Charades can be a useful tool with the children. Wally can help focus the children's attention onto the PIO. Use of a disaster supply kit with Wally worked well. The more animated Wally is, the better he is received. A good working relationship with the PIO is vital. Wally and the PIO must work together to get out the message. Mr. Brown discussed the difficulties in wearing the suit. Heat, gloves, vision, and shoes, all pose problems. It is recommended to drink lots of water. There may be a need to develop a large straw to assist in drinking, and use a hand fan.

Summary of Presentation by Pam Bacon, Indiana

Pam Bacon, PIO, Parke County, Indiana, discussed PIO's best methods for working Wally. Plan ahead when going to schools, and work with teachers to structure the group size and age. Meet with teachers prior to school presentations to check the facility and to coordinate assistance. Keep the group small and the age consistent. Try to involve the teacher in the presentation, even if it is just to ensure crowd control, logistics, and student attention. Adding variety to the "routine" can make it better for both the PIO and Wally. Coloring pages work especially well with the youngest children to keep their hands busy while they listen to the presentation. With older children, have Wally make an early appearance and then disappear while the PIO finishes the presentation. Wally products can be expensive. For example, Wally Stickers cost $1,567 for 10,000 stickers. However, it is a good idea to have give-a-ways for children.

Web Page
Tuesday, June 30, and Wednesday July 1, 1998
3:30 PM and 8:00 AM

Summary of Presentation by Paul Hewett, Argonne National Laboratory

The initial presentation consisted of a walk-through of the U. S. Army CSEPP Web site. Areas highlighted included:

Calendar:	Shows national level events, currently national functional IPTs, exercises, national level functional meetings. Calendar items links to information about the event (i.e., sponsor, hotel, local POC). Events are submitted electronically through the web site.
IPT Minutes:	Minutes are published here for FEMIS, off-post monitoring, and exercise IPTs. Minutes are first approved by the IPT, then provided to ANL by the CSEPP Office representative to be placed on the site. This area was used by the off-post monitoring and exercise IPTs to publish draft reports for review. Built-in comment pages allowed for direct e-mail submission of comments to Army and FEMA representatives.
Bibliography:	Currently has copies of all policy papers. The Army/FEMA MOU, CSEPP Planning Guidance, and other programmatic documents have been identified to be included in this area.
Army CSEPP Staff Listing:	A listing of the Army staff working CSEPP, which includes e-mail links and hot links to information on their areas of expertise (e.g., automation).
Related Web Sites:	Provides links to all CSEPP state sites, FEMA, Army, CBDCOM, and Surety Field Activity.
Search Capability:	Allows the site to be searched without going page-by-page.
CSEPP Community Pages:	Essentially an Intranet or private area for CSEPP users. Entry by recognized server location or by guest status. Contains news groups - electronic bulletin boards for free exchange of ideas. The CSEPP resource guide (a joint Army/FEMA Public Affairs publication) is also posted here. Other items, such as Y2K bug patches, can be found in this area.

The future of the web site was discussed. Army and FEMA management have agreed to use this web site as a method to disseminate CSEPP management guidance. The goal is to have a separate web site area for each function (training, exercises, PAO, etc.). Areas for each function could be on both the public and private side of the site.

Summary of Presentation by Dan Lonai, Umatilla

This presentation was on the use of a web site by CSEPP counties for public education and outreach. Dan Lonai, Systems Administrator for Morrow and Umatilla Counties CSEPP, gave a tour of the counties' web site. He highlighted the many information functions embedded in the site, including Request for Proposal publication, dissemination of the CSEPP newsletter, information on the chemical stockpile and other technical and natural hazards, a CSEPP fact book, and a "fun" area for kids. He followed the tour with a discussion of the difficulties associated with establishing and maintaining a web site.